

## MINUTES

### CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

NOVEMBER 16, 2015

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present:

Acting Chairman Ron Reim  
Mark Winings, Aldermanic Representative  
Craig Owens, City Manager  
Josh Corson  
Sherry Eisenberg  
Pepe Finn

Absent:

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld

Also Present:

Louis Clayton, Planner  
Susan M. Istenes, AICP, Planning Director  
Ken Heinz, Acting City Attorney

Acting Chairman Reim asked that all cell phone ringers be turned off, that conversations take place outside the meeting room and that those who wish to speak approach the podium and to be sure the green light on the microphone is on for property recording of this meeting.

## MINUTES

The minutes of the November 2, 2015 meeting were approved, after having been previously distributed to each member.

### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – ADDITION/ALTERATION – SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE - 7620 MARYLAND AVENUE (CONTINUED)

Chris Dalton, owner, was in attendance at the meeting. Also in attendance was Val Grewe, project architect.

Susan Istenes explained that this project was first presented to the Architectural Review Board on November 2, 2015, and was continued at the request of the Board, with the suggestion that the applicant present samples of all proposed building materials and consider revising the design of the

front entry. The applicant has not made any plan revisions. The existing 2-story home measures 2,117 square feet, and the proposed project consists of the construction of two, 2-story additions on the front and rear of the home, totaling 1,770-square feet. The height of the home with the additions is 27 feet 6 inches as measured from average existing grade to the mid-point of the roof. The new additions will not exceed the height of the existing home. The rear addition is constructed of red brick to match the home, the roof of the rear addition is clad with slate textured fiberglass shingles, and bronze colored double-hung windows are proposed. A cedar deck is proposed on the rear of the addition. The front addition is located within the footprint of the existing front porch and is constructed with a limestone veneer and acrylic stucco accents with a limestone finish. The proposed roof of the front addition is clad with salvaged slate shingles from the front porch, and bronze colored double-hung windows and doors are proposed. The existing wood siding on the gable ends on each side of the home will be replaced with acrylic stucco with a limestone finish. The amount of stucco does not exceed 13.9 percent on any elevation. An existing asphalt driveway located on the east side of the site will be replaced and expanded with a new exposed aggregate driveway which will lead to a side loading garage located on the lower level of the rear addition. One tan overhead garage door is proposed. No permanent fences or retaining walls are proposed. Susan stated that staff has concerns that the proposed roofing material on the rear addition will not match the existing slate roof. Otherwise, staff is of the opinion that the proposed design of the additions is consistent with the existing design and materials on the home and on other homes in the neighborhood and recommends that the applicant present samples of the existing and proposed roof materials at the meeting for the Architectural Review Board to determine compatibility.

Mr. Grewe presented a color rendering (front elevation) and photo of the existing front elevation to the members. He explained that they plan to enclose the front porch (North elevation) as the front of the house is currently dark and shadowy and the owners want more light in the front. He noted that traditional materials are being used; samples of the proposed brick, limestone, acrylic stucco and roof were presented. He stated that the color of the roof can be matched; that the salvaged slate roof will be used for the new construction in front; the cultured slate will only be used in the rear and one would never see both roofs in the same plane.

Acting Chairman Reim asked if they are removing the entire south facing roof.

Mr. Grewe replied "not all of it".

Acting Chairman Reim commented that from the rear (south), one would see both roofing materials. He referred to a discussion held during the previous presentation that this proposal does not include a covering at the front entrance.

Mr. Grewe stated that there is a 7-inch projection around the door. He indicated that there are 7 homes on the street including one to the east (2 doors down) that don't have a front canopy/covering. He stated that they want natural light and that's the reason for the amount of proposed glass in front. He referenced the photo of the existing home, noting that it is quite dark.

Acting Chairman Reim asked if there were any additional questions or comments from the members or the audience.

None were received.

Acting Chairman Reim asked staff their opinion about the proposed roofing material.

Louis Clayton stated that staff is okay with it and that if this Board agrees, there's no need to mention staff's recommendation in the motion.

Josh Corson asked why they are not matching the existing roof.

Mr. Grewe stated that they don't think they can; it's over 60 years old. He added that they feel their material proposal is far superior and assured the members they would get a good color match and the same size shingle to what's existing.

Tom Caspari, 7624 Maryland Avenue, stated that they could get slate to match; he then questioned why they are not replacing the entire roof with the new roofing material as the mix will be seen from the rear. He stated it's not appropriate to mix roofing material and that they should either match existing or do all new. He noted he is a slate contractor.

Pepe Finn asked if there is an ordinance that requires slate.

Louis Clayton stated that there is not; it's at the discretion of this Board.

Mr. Caspari questioned how they will get more light in front considering it's a northern exposure.

Mr. Grewe replied "more glass, more light".

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board or the audience, Josh Corson made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Pepe Finn and received the following roll call vote: Ayes: Acting Chairman Ron Reim, Craig Owens, Mark Winings, Pepe Finn & Josh Corson. Nays: Sherry Eisenberg. Motion carried.

#### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – EXTERIOR RENOVATION – COMMERCIAL – 16 SOUTH BEMISTON AVENUE (LOUIE'S WINE DIVE)

Ben Van Zant, restaurant VP, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that this request was first presented to the Architectural Review Board on October 19, 2015 and was continued at the request of the Board, with the suggestion that the applicant revise the plans to accurately depict all proposed improvements, materials and colors. The applicant has made the following revisions to the plans:

1. More detail provided on the front elevation rendering for the garage door window.
2. Existing EIFS and brick shown to be painted Bohemian Black.
3. Existing EIFS trim panels shown to be painted gray (Peppercorn).

The subject property is located on the east side of South Bemiston Avenue between Forsyth Boulevard and Carondelet Avenue. The property has a zoning designation of High Density Commercial District (HDC) and is located in the CBD Overlay Zoning District. The property contains a one-story, gray EIFS and brick commercial building, most recently occupied by Tani Sushi. In conjunction with an interior renovation of the building, the applicant proposes to install reclaimed wood to the front façade and a small portion of the south side of the building. The existing EIFS and brick will be painted Bohemian Black and the EIFS trim panels will be painted gray (Peppercorn). The southernmost window on the front elevation will be removed and replaced with a garage door window. The size of the window opening will not change. Also proposed are new black canvas awnings, new railing adjacent to the front entry, and a new window on the alley side of the building. Signage shown on the plan is for illustration only and is not being considered at this time. Based on the City's Bicycle Parking Regulations, the proposed use is required to provide one bicycle rack. The Public Works Department has conditionally approved the request to place the required bicycle rack on the public sidewalk in front of the building. The proposed changes will significantly change the building's appearance. Wood siding is rarely used as a building material in Downtown. In cases where it has been used, it has a contemporary appearance through the use of high-quality hardwood siding with standard sized planks installed in a regular pattern. Samples of the proposed reclaimed wood siding were presented at the October 19 meeting and appear to be a high quality material, consistent with other existing applications Downtown. The rest of the building will be painted Bohemian Black with gray accents. The front rendering notes that the existing EIFS panel will be painted, but it is not accurately represented. There are several examples of black and dark gray buildings in the immediate vicinity with a variety of materials (glazed brick, granite, stucco) and staff is of the opinion that the proposed colors are compatible with existing structures. The proposed garage door window is the same size as the existing window opening and when closed, will appear much like the existing window. Although no similar examples are found Downtown, there are several examples of window and door systems that open completely thereby creating an open air storefront. Staff is of the opinion that the inclusion of a fully operable, retractable window will generate street level activity while having minimal visual impact. Other changes to the building including awning replacement, new railings, and new windows are minor and in staff's opinion are acceptable. Susan stated that staff recommends approval with the following conditions, to be approved by staff prior to building permit issuance:

1. That the applicant submit a site plan showing the location of the required bicycle rack in conformance with the Bicycle Parking Regulations.
2. That the applicant submit a revised front elevation rendering accurately depicting the proposed paint color for the existing EIFS.

Mr. Van Zant indicated that they made the changes suggested at the previous meeting. He presented a color sample of the Bohemian Black.

It was noted that on Sheet AE12, the color is shown as gray but it's noted as black.

Mr. Van Zant stated that gray is only on the trim.

Sherry Eisenberg asked where the wood will be.

Mr. Van Zant replied that the wood is at the windows.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Pepe Finn made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Josh Corson and unanimously approved by the Board.

SITE PLAN REVIEW/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - NEW CONSTRUCTION – SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 8318 UNIVERSITY DRIVE

Paul Fendler, project architect, and Chris Peeples, civil engineer, were in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that this is a request for review of the site plan associated with the proposed construction of a 2-story, 4,796-square-foot single-family residence (not including the basement) with an attached, side-entry, at-grade garage. The height of the proposed residence is 28 feet as measured from the average existing grade to the mean height of the roof. Also proposed are a 13-foot tall, 225-square-foot accessory building and a pool. The applicant is proposing to use a geothermal system that doesn't require exterior mechanical equipment. Pool equipment will be located at the south side of the home adjacent to the garage and will be screened by a painted wood fence. Trash will be stored in a 40-square-foot trash enclosure located at the south side of the home adjacent to the garage. The trash enclosure will be screened by a painted wood fence and gate. The Clayton Gardens Urban Design District limits impervious coverage to 40 percent of the total lot and allows an increase in impervious coverage for projects that meet certain criteria. For this project, the allowable impervious coverage is increased to 50 percent for the inclusion of an at-grade, side-loading garage. The existing impervious coverage on site is 25 percent. The new plans increase the impervious coverage to 48 percent, which is below the maximum allowable impervious coverage of 50 percent. The existing storm water runoff, according to the MSD 15 year, 20 minute calculation, is 0.558 cubic feet per second (CFS). The proposed runoff is 0.669 CFS, which represents an increase in 0.111 CFS, and therefore on site storm water mitigation is required. To mitigate the increase in storm water runoff, all downspouts will be piped to a dry well in the northeast corner of the lot. The Public Works Department has reviewed and approved the plans with the condition that the site plan be revised to provide additional pop up emitters in order to equally distribute the storm water flow throughout the yard. The proposed landscape design features a variety of understory trees, ornamental shrubs and perennials that are appropriate for the size of the site and character of the neighborhood. The landscape plan shows the removal of 42 caliper inches of trees, all of which require onsite replacement. The landscape plan proposes 70

caliper inches of new deciduous and broadleaf evergreen trees. The City's contracted landscape architect is of the opinion that the proposed trees are suitable for the site. The proposed construction wash-down is located within the critical root zone of an existing street tree, and therefore notes should be added to the landscape plan to root prune the tree prior to installation of the construction fence and wash-down station. All other existing trees to remain are shown to be protected and preserved per City guidelines. The proposed exposed aggregate driveway located on the east side of the property measures 12 feet wide at the property line; therefore, the applicant is requesting alternative compliance. According to the applicant, the location of an existing street tree requires that the driveway angle out and curve around the tree to exit onto Lancaster Drive. Due to his configuration, backing out of the driveway onto Lancaster would create a difficult and dangerous condition. A 12-foot wide driveway would create a higher degree of maneuverability when exiting the property onto the street, which will in turn create a safer condition for the homeowner. Due to the unique site conditions and the relatively minor deviation from the standard, staff supports granting alternative compliance for the proposed 12-foot wide driveway. Exterior lighting is proposed at the exterior doors, garage, and accessory building. All exterior lights will be 75 watts or less. Susan stated that the proposed home is compatible with surrounding homes in the neighborhood, that storm water will be adequately managed on site, and the landscape plan provides for a variety of new trees, shrubs, and groundcover that is suitable for the area. The height, setbacks, and impervious coverage as proposed are in conformance with the requirements of the R-2 Single Family Dwelling District and the Clayton Gardens Urban Design District; that staff is of the opinion that the project meets the criteria for site plan approval and recommends approval of the site plan with the following conditions, to be approved by staff prior to the issuance of a building permit:

1. That the site plan be revised to provide additional pop up emitters in order to equally distribute the storm water flow throughout the yard.
2. To ensure the future maintenance and operation of the dry well, the applicant shall record the approved site plan with St. Louis County, and submit proof of recording to the City prior to the issuance of a building permit.
3. That the landscape plan be revised to include notes to root prune the impacted street tree prior to installation of the construction fence and wash-down station.

Mr. Peeples indicated that lot coverage will be increased to 48%. He noted that grading will be minimal and the building elevation raised 9-inches. He noted that the current flow onto adjacent sites is not being changed. He informed the members that MSD has approved the proposed design including the addition of pop up emitters.

Acting Chairman Reim asked if they will be able to maneuver their vehicle with the wider driveway.

Mr. Peeples replied "yes".

Acting Chairman Reim asked what storm event the drywell will absorb.

Mr. Peeples replied “MSD 20 minute; 20 year (1 hour)”.

Sherry Eisenberg asked about tree removal.

Mr. Fendler informed the members that the landscape architect is not here this evening, but he will attempt to answer questions.

Sherry Eisenberg asked for confirmation that trees are not being planted where existing ones are removed.

Mr. Fendler confirmed, noting that the required caliper inches are being replaced; just not in the same location as the ones being removed.

Acting Chairman Reim asked if he’s okay with the three staff recommendations.

Mr. Fendler replied “yes”.

Acting Chairman Reim solicited additional comments from the members or the audience.

Jack Hambene, 8330 University, commented that this is a handsome addition to the area and asked that they maintain the grade; noting a potential water problem if a pool is added.

Louis Clayton announced that the approved site plan is included in the building permit set and inspected by the City.

Susan McGowan, 8317 University, informed the members that she has lived here since 1990 and that her property is at the bottom of a hill. She stated that change is good; however, she has incurred water damage over the years, noting in 1997 her back yard was under 6-inches of water. She asked that the sites be magnetically swept regularly as she has had three flat tires in ten years resulting from nails in the street from construction sites. She then wished the new owners many years of happiness in their new home.

Mr. Peeples reiterated that there will be very minimal grading done to this lot.

Mark Winings asked if there are any requirements regarding picking up nails.

Susan Istenes replied “no”.

Ms. McGowan asked if two City trees are being removed.

Louis Clayton informed Ms. McGowan that the two street (City) trees are to remain; however, they will be impacted by construction and therefore require protection measures to be put in place.

Ms. McGowan indicated that when two trees came down at 233 Lancaster it felt like an earthquake and resulted in damage to her house.

Being no further questions or comments, Josh Corson made a motion to approve the site plan per staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mark Winings and unanimously approved by the members.

The architectural aspects of the project were now up for review.

Susan Istenes explained that the proposed project consists of the demolition of an existing one-story home and the construction of a 2-story, 4,796-square-foot single-family residence (not including the basement) with an attached, side-entry, at-grade garage. The height of the proposed residence is 28 feet as measured from the average existing grade to the mean height of the roof. Also proposed are a +/- 13-foot tall, 225-square-foot accessory building and a pool. The 2-story home to the west (8330 University Drive) was constructed in 2001 and is 2 feet taller than the proposed home (as measured from the mid-point of each roof). The home to the south (127 Lancaster Drive) was constructed in 2013 and is 2 feet taller than the proposed home (as measured from the mid-point of each roof). As required by Section 410.385 of the Clayton Gardens Urban Design District, new homes must provide a transition in height and scale to the existing adjacent homes. According to the applicant, the proposed home will use the following techniques:

1. The house “steps down” at the corner to minimize the appearance of mass at the street level.
2. The design utilizes both two-story and one-story forms to avoid a tall, blocky building.
3. The roof pitch and overhang is typical to that of adjacent homes.

Clayton Gardens has traditionally been dominated by the use of standard size brick in a variety of red tones, although the original brick has been painted in some instances. The primary building material for the proposed home is limestone colored brick. The proposed roof is clad in grey fiberglass shingles. A black standing seam metal roof will be used on a small portion of the east elevation and above the front entry. Black casement windows are proposed. The proposed 225-square-foot accessory building is located at the southwest corner of the property and is +/- 13 feet tall as measured from grade to the mid-point of the roof. The building is constructed with brick columns, wood-framed screen panels and a black standing seam metal roof. A new exposed aggregate driveway is proposed on the east side of the property. The new driveway will lead to a side-entry, at-grade garage with a wood carriage garage door. A 6-foot tall stained wood and brick fence will enclose the rear yard. No retaining walls are proposed. Susan stated that the project as proposed is in conformance with the requirements of the R-2 Single Family Dwelling District, the Clayton Gardens Urban Design District, and the Architectural Review Guidelines; staff is of the opinion that the design is compatible in terms of mass, height, and design with existing nearby homes and recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. Fendler presented a color rendering to the members and material samples to the members. He noted there are a couple of metal roofs and the windows are black frame.

Acting Chairman Reim commented that it's a handsome house.

Being no further questions or comments and hearing none from the audience, Pepe Finn made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Sherry Eisenberg and unanimously approved by the Board.

#### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – FRONT YARD RETAINING WALL – 417 OAKLEY

Roger Kepner, contractor, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the subject property is located on the west side of Oakley Drive between Edgewood and Shirley Drives. In September 2015, a new retaining wall was approved administratively and constructed along the south side of the driveway behind the front building line. The retaining wall was constructed using tan-colored, standard size modular blocks. While not an approved material, the wall is located almost entirely below grade and minimally visible from the street and adjacent properties. On October 14, 2015, a city inspector observed a second retaining wall under construction along the north side of the driveway between the house and the public sidewalk. The wall is constructed with the same materials as the previously approved wall. Section 405.1900 of the Zoning Code requires that all front yard retaining walls in residential zoning districts be approved by the Architectural Review Board prior to installation. The applicant has not submitted subdivision trustee approval. The Architectural Review Guidelines recommend that retaining walls be constructed of brick, stone or stucco to match the main structure. Modular block wall systems have been approved in the past provided they have varying block sizes, varying color patterns and tumbled or rolled edges. The material used in this case has tumbled/rolled edges, but does not have varying block sizes or color patterns. While the previously approved retaining wall was not a permitted material, it was not highly visible from the street. The front yard retaining wall is highly visible from the street and has a stronger visual impact. Therefore, staff recommends that the front yard retaining wall be replaced with a wall constructed with an approved retaining wall material. The Public Works Department has reviewed the plans and finds the placement of the retaining wall in the right-of-way acceptable, but has concerns regarding the new pipe which will discharge water onto the driveway and public sidewalk. If the pipe is connected to a downspout, it should be removed and popup emitters should be installed in the yard. If it is a relief drain for the retaining wall then staff recommends the pipe be removed and the wall be redesigned. Staff's recommendation is to deny the request as submitted and require that the applicant submit plans depicting an approved retaining wall material and drain design as requested by Public Works, to be approved by staff prior to installation.

Mr. Kepner indicated that nobody informed him that trustee approval was needed, but they have it now.

Louis Clayton stated that trustee approval was submitted to staff earlier today.

Mr. Kepner indicated that they received a permit to build the wall in the back and during the process of construction it was discovered that there was a downspout at the corner of the driveway was covered with mulch which was causing drainage into the basement. He stated that in his experience, pop-ups fail and that the best solution is to daylight. He presented photos of a neighbor who has the same walls. He indicated that staff's report does not make sense to him.

Acting Chairman Ron Reim asked if the wall was approved.

Louis Clayton announced that walls below four feet in height don't require a building permit; however, there are still material regulations. He added that he believes the administrative approval was only for the wall behind the front building line.

Craig Owens informed the other members the approval came after the wall was built.

Acting Chairman Reim asked if there are other ways to get water out.

Mr. Kepner stated that pop-ups are a cheap solution and not a good one.

Josh Corson asked if there are other systems that can be used.

Louis Clayton indicated that the installation of pop-ups is what the Public Works Department recommended. He added that during the winter water flows onto the sidewalk and freezes.

Mr. Kepner stated that water won't freeze when it flows out.

Pepe Finn asked where the closest drain is located.

Mr. Kepner stated that he doesn't know.

Josh Corson questioned if this Board can approve drainage like that.

Louis Clayton replied that he believes so; a portion of the wall is in the city's right-of-way.

Mark Winings made reference to Mr. Kepner's earlier comment about other neighborhood properties with similar walls.

Mr. Kepner stated that the property to the south (in the picture) and another up the hill have similar walls.

Acting Chairman Reim commented that there seems to be a lack of consistency.

Susan Istenes stated that the Board has allowed man-made block systems that have tumbled edges and varying sizes/color variations.

Craig Owens explained that at the time of the administrative approval, the rear wall had already been built and because of its minimal visibility, he approved it; the front wall had not been constructed yet.

Josh Corson commented that he likes that the two walls are the same.

Acting Chairman Reim stated that he's not thrilled by the material but that he wants a pop-up emitter.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Josh Corson made a motion to approve the wall as constructed with the condition that a pop up emitter be installed as staff recommends. The motion was seconded by Mark Winings and unanimously approved by the Board.

#### CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – RESTAURANT – 216 NORTH MERAMEC AVENUE (HAMPTON INN)

Conor Pandl, representing Equis Hospitality Management, LLC, owner, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that this request is for consideration of a Conditional Use Permit for the operation of a restaurant to be known as Danielle's Place. The subject property is located on the east side of North Meramec Avenue between Maryland Avenue and Kingsbury Boulevard and has a zoning designation of Planned Unit Development (PUD). The property is developed with a Hampton Inn Hotel that opened in October 2014. A condition of the PUD approval was that the hotel contain a public restaurant. The 2,282-square-foot restaurant space is located on the ground floor of the hotel and accommodates 70 seats indoors. Breakfast is available for purchase during the morning hours, and a select menu of small plate appetizers and entrees is available in the evenings. The restaurant is currently operating and has a liquor license. The restaurant is open Monday through Friday from 6:30 am to 9:30 am, and from 4:30 pm to 11:00 pm; and Saturday and Sunday from 7:00 am to 10:00 am, and from 4:30 pm to 11:00 pm. Deliveries to the restaurant are made in the morning through the building's side entrance. Delivery service from the restaurant is not proposed. Trash is stored in existing receptacles located in the loading area and the restaurant does not participate in a recycling program. Valet services are located on North Meramec Avenue. Because the restaurant is located in the Central Business District and is less than 3,000 square feet, it is exempt from providing off-street parking. Based on the City's Bicycle Parking Regulations the proposed restaurant is required to provide one bicycle rack; however, one has not been shown on the plans. Staff recommends that the applicant submit a site plan showing the location of the required bicycle rack in conformance with the Bicycle Parking Regulations, to be approved by staff

prior to the issuance of a building permit. Susan stated that staff is of the opinion that the restaurant meets the requirements contained in the regulations governing conditional uses. The restaurant space is comparable in size, hours of operation, and method of deliveries with other restaurants Downtown. Based on the information regarding the operation of the restaurant as provided by the applicant, staff is of the opinion that the proposed restaurant will be compatible with surrounding uses and recommends approval of the Conditional Use Permit to the Board of Aldermen with the condition that the applicant submit a site plan showing the location of the required bicycle rack in conformance with the Bicycle Parking Regulations, to be approved by staff prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Pandl stated that this is the final stage of the hotel development. He added that they will comply with staff's recommendation to provide bicycle parking.

Acting Chairman Reim asked if they are currently operating.

Mr. Pandl replied "yes".

Hearing no further questions or comments, Josh Corson made a motion to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit to the Board of Aldermen. The motion was seconded by Pepe Finn and unanimously approved by the Board.

#### CONCEPTUAL PRESENTATION – MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT – 7601-7651 CLAYTON ROAD (SCHNUCK'S SITE)

Jim Fredericks, Posenelli Law Firm, representing the applicant, was in attendance at the meeting. Ben Owenell, Darren Moore and Preston Dial representing GBT Realty, developer, and Jack Holleran & Tyson Pyle, project architects, were also in attendance.

Susan Istenes explained that the 3.3-acre site includes two separate properties bounded by Hanley Road to the west, Clayton Road to the south, and Westwood Drive to the east. The western property (7651 Clayton Road) has a zoning designation of C-1 Neighborhood Commercial District and is improved with a one-story commercial building (former Schnuck's) which was constructed in 1950 and has been vacant since 2003. The eastern property (7601 Clayton Road) has a zoning designation of R-6 Medium Density Multiple Dwelling District, is located in the Westwood Corridor Urban Design Zoning District, and is improved with a surface parking lot. Adjacent land uses include multi-family and commercial to the west, multi-family to the north and east, and single-family to the south. The proposed project consists of the demolition of the existing structure and the construction of a 537,740-square-foot mixed-use development. Access to the site is proposed from Hanley Road near the existing access point, mid-block from Clayton Road, and from Westwood Avenue for residents only. The west end of the site will include a two-story structure containing 43,000 square feet of ground floor retail space including a grocery store, and 42,000 square feet of second floor office space. A surface parking lot with a single row of parking is proposed between the building and Hanley and Clayton Roads. The east end of the site will

include a 488-space parking structure, a 4-5-story residential building wrapping the parking structure containing 44 units, and a 12-story residential building containing 247 units. The proposed development will be constructed primarily of brick, stone, glass, EIFS, and concrete. The project will be developed as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and will require public hearings before the Plan Commission and Board of Aldermen. As currently proposed, the project will require zoning waivers for height, setbacks, parking, and density. The applicant has not specified what public benefits will be provided to the City in exchange for the requested zoning waivers. The western property is not located in an urban design or overlay zoning district, but is subject to the following design standards which affect the site and building form:

- Stepbacks: For buildings permitted to exceed the maximum height through the planned unit development procedure, a 15-foot stepback (upper story building setback) shall be provided beginning at the 3<sup>rd</sup>-story level or 30 feet above grade, whichever is less.
- Parking: Surface parking lots and parking structures with parking at ground level are not permitted along the street frontage.

The eastern property has a zoning designation of R-6 Medium Density Multiple Dwelling District and is located in the Westwood Corridor Urban Design District (UDD). The intent of the Westwood Corridor UDD is to ensure that redevelopment responds to and protects the established character of the Westwood Corridor. The UDD has detailed development standards for building orientation, lot coverage, setbacks, parking, building materials, height, massing, and architectural details. A more detailed submittal is required to evaluate the project's compliance with the UDD standards. The Clayton Master Plan was adopted in 1975 and was last updated in 1989. The Master Plan designates the western property as "commercial" on the Future Land Use Plan and the eastern property as "mid density multi-family (25-45 units per acre)". A project of this scale requires a thorough staff review prior to a public hearing. The project will be reviewed and is subject to comments by the Planning, Public Works, and Fire Departments, and also the City's contracted consultants for landscaping, architecture, storm water management, traffic and parking. Staff offers the following comments based on the conceptual plans presented.

### Planning

1. Eliminate the row of surface parking between the western building and Clayton and Hanley Roads, and relocate the building adjacent to the street frontage. The Zoning Regulations prohibit parking lots along the street frontage and front yard parking is out of character for the area, especially along Clayton Road. Locating the building frontage at or near the front property lines creates a strong street wall and improves the pedestrian environment. Where additional setback is necessary, activate the area with a courtyard by incorporating outdoor dining, seating, water features, or public art.
2. This site is located at a prominent southern gateway to the City, and staff recommends the design of the southwest corner of the building be enhanced to include a more prominent architectural and/or gateway feature.

3. A portion of the parking structure is visible from Clayton Road and should be properly screened by a building or architectural treatment.
4. Unify the design of the residential and commercial buildings through consistent massing, articulation, and materials.

### Public Works

1. The development is subject to the recommendations of the traffic impact study conducted by the City's contracted traffic engineer and reviewed by Public Works and St. Louis County Department of Transportation. The developer may be required to make such improvements to adjacent streets including but not limited to restrictions at ingress/egress locations, turn lanes, medians, and new and/or improved signalized intersections.
2. The design of sidewalks, tree lawns, and other similar infrastructure in the City's rights-of-way will be to City standards.
3. Land Disturbance and Right-of-Way Permits will be required through the Public Works Department. Any work affecting Hanley and Clayton Roads will have to be permitted through St. Louis County.

Susan stated that staff recommends that the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board consider the proposal and provide input. She emphasized that this is conceptual review only and therefore any comments made in this report or at the meeting by the applicant, staff, or the Board/Commission members, are not binding.

Mr. Fredericks indicated that the property has been vacant for 12 years and that it is his understanding that there have been 8 former proposals for this property and that this is the best so far. He informed the members that they have met with the neighbors on two occasions; the first meeting 120 neighbors attended and 80 neighbors attended the second meeting. He stated that 95% of the people in attendance were interested and liked the way it was designed; adding that the applicants have done their homework. He noted that this is not the first design concept.

A conceptual site plan was presented. Mr. Fredericks explained that this is a mixed-use project consisting of residential (condos and apartments), office and retail, including a grocery store and restaurant and two more stores. He noted that the neighborhood wants a grocery store. He asked that he be allowed to reference Planning staff recommendations in reverse order, noting that they respect all direction given by this Board/Commission. He stated that they can/will comply with recommendations 2-4, which leaves the issue of parking. He informed the members that the row of surface parking between the western building and Clayton and Hanley Roads is not for use by the residents, grocery store or office; it's for limited use by the retail and restaurant components and that without these uses, the project may not succeed. He noted that there is no on-street parking and they need parking for the restaurant and for the retail. He stated that personally, he would not want to dine outside at Clayton and Hanley Road. He asked the City to reconsider the parking issues, noting that PUDs allow for flexibility.

Acting Chairman Reim commented that not only is it a long way to a final decision the traffic and parking studies have not yet been completed. He asked that they discuss ingress/egress.

Mr. Fredericks explained that the main entrance to the site off Clayton Road is a round-a-bout which provides easy in/easy out. He noted that vehicles can exit onto Westwood.

Josh Corson asked if commercial vehicles can also exit onto Westwood.

Mr. Pyle indicated that delivery trucks can exit onto Westwood.

Pepe Finn asked how many parking spaces per unit are being provided.

Mr. Pyle indicate that CBB (Crawford, Bunte & Braemmeier) has not yet performed the parking study, so that information is not yet available.

Pepe Finn stated that she's trying to imaging 400+ cars on Westwood.

Mr. Pyle asked that they wait for CBB's report. He noted that there are challenges utilizing Westwood and noted the amount of traffic congestion at Clayton and Hanley Roads.

Josh Corson stated that he is excited about the project; that it will be great for the City; however, he is concerned about loading trucks driving Westwood which is a residential street.

Mr. Pyle noted that the topography prevents semis from driving on the deck.

Acting Chairman Reim commented that there will be a significant amount more traffic from Westwood onto Clayton Road.

Mr. Pyle agreed.

Acting Chairman Reim asked that they discuss the commercial aspects of the project.

Mr. Pyle indicated that the restaurant will be at the southwest corner of the site; as this is a prominent corner there will be substantial streetscape and landscaping and a buffer zone (setback) of 16-feet. He added that he sees this as a highly walkable destination and they want the sidewalks far enough from the streets. He noted the grocer will be off Clayton Road and that the parking deck will be wrapped with residential.

Josh Corson asked for confirmation that no cart corrals will be outside.

Mr. Pyle confirmed. He noted the ventilated deck (no open air) is totally screened and the roof deck (green roof) will be an amenity space that will include a pool.

Acting Chairman Reim mentioned reducing the parking along the street frontage; keeping vehicles inside the site. He asked the logic of the location of the residential tower.

Mr. Pyle indicated that the views from the building and not blocking views of those to the north. He noted the building is set back a fair bit from the street.

Josh Corson asked if a shadow study has been done.

Mr. Pyle replied “not yet”.

Sherry Eisenberg asked the number of surface parking spaces.

Mr. Pyle stated he didn’t know off the top of his head; there are 47 spaces up front. He noted that all residents access the parking deck from the round-a-bout.

Acting Chairman Reim asked if there is a way to increase greenspace.

Mr. Pyle stated that they can look at that.

Josh Corson commented that he agrees with staff; the corner needs to “pop”.

Acting Chairman Reim stated that this is a once in a lifetime opportunity here and everyone wants it to be right; it needs to make a spectacular architectural statement.

Josh Corson agreed; adding that it seems as though they are trying to match the condo building.

Mark Winings asked if left in and left outs will be allowed along Clayton and Hanley Roads.

Acting Chairman Reim commented that the County probably wouldn’t allow that. He asked about materials.

Mr. Pyle stated that they are trying to stitch together multiple uses and aspiring to be a destination.

Acting Chairman Reim asked what is on top of the residential tower.

Mr. Pyle replied “a setback penthouse”.

Sherry Eisenberg asked the distance between the garage and the retail/restaurant.

Mr. Pyle replied about 100 feet.

Sherry Eisenberg asked the population of the residential building.

Mr. Owenell stated that 60-70% of the units will be one bedroom units (450-650 square feet); some two bedroom 950 square foot units and three bedroom, 1,600 square foot units will also be available. He added that they will look at the market.

Josh Corson asked if the project only allows right turns onto Westwood; preventing large trucks on Westwood.

Mr. Owenell replied “yes”.

Josh Corson asked about a traffic signal.

Mr. Owenell indicated that CBB will address that.

Josh Corson questioned where motorists will go after entering the site via the round-a-bout if the surface parking is eliminated. He added that he does not believe people will drive around the block.

Mr. Owenell stated that they will work with the City and CBB.

Craig Owens stated that he likes the materials; glazing, stone, masonry, and that the green roof is a positive feature.

Acting Chairman Reim stated that he sees a lot of good things here and that there’s room to improve.

Josh Corson commented that they are going about this the right way and that is appreciated.

Acting Chairman Reim solicited audience comments.

Larissa (?), condo owner on Westwood, stated that this won’t improve the gateway; the tower is in a residential area and she is against 4 a.m. truck traffic.

Shelly Evangel, 715 Westwood, referred to the Westwood Corridor Urban Design District, asking that it be followed with regard to height (5 stories max). She stated she likes the potential uses, but a 12 story tower along Westwood makes no sense. She added that street trees would have to be removed. She asked that the City consider the number of new students that will be added to Glenridge School.

Kent Lindstrom, area condo owner, voiced his concern regarding safety, noise and traffic congestion on Westwood.

Richard Goldberg, 900 South Hanley Road, stated that this is a workable design and a beautiful possibility and he applauds the residential building being on the east end of the site.

William Buddy, 622 South Hanley Road, stated that he loves the project and suggests moving forward with it. He stated that he loves the design.

Chris Shay, 7506 Byron, voiced his concern regarding the increase in residents and the resulting parking and spill-over.

Jerry Parker, Buckingham resident, stated that it seems to him the project should be flipped (residential tower on the west side).

Debbie Selvaduari, owner of property in the Moorlands, indicated that it's a great concept.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Acting Chairman Reim announced that this concludes the conceptual review.

Mr. Pyle noted that the City has codes as to when loading/unloading can take place and emphasized that the project calls for a right only onto Westwood unless the traffic report suggests otherwise. He added that the 70% 1 bedroom is a different demographic and that 40,000 square feet of retail will bring in about \$900,000 in retail tax revenue and about 650 jobs. He emphasized that the main entrance is off Clayton Road and that they are following current zoning; the tower is not on Westwood, it's 70-80 feet off the street.

Being no further question or comments, this meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

---

Recording Secretary